



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,780	03/21/2001	Jianmin Li	BSC-164	4881

21323 7590 05/20/2003

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP  
HIGH STREET TOWER  
125 HIGH STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

WARE, TODD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/813,780

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Todd D Ware

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-21, 29-32 and 43-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17, 22-28 and 33-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2, 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of information disclosure statements filed 3-21-01 and 11-24-01 and election filed 2-12-03 is acknowledged.

#### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 18-21, 29-32, and 43-45 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 7.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 9-17, 22-23, 26, 27-28, 33-35, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sierra (6,110,484; hereafter '484).
5. The instant claims are directed toward medical devices having resorbable particles embedded in a resorbable matrix where the particles resorb at a different (faster) rate than the matrix.
6. '484 discloses biomedical implants having resorbable particles (e.g. calcium alginate particles) embedded within a resorbable matrix where the particles degrade

Art Unit: 1615

faster than the matrix in which they are implanted to form pores within the matrix (abstract; C 2, L 50-C 4, L 5-67; C 6, L 26-C 7, L 34). The size of the particles and the ratio of particles by volume are within the instant claimed range (C 3, L 30-45).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1615

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 4-8, 24-25, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sierra (6,110,484; hereafter '484) in view of Ronan et al (6,060,534; hereafter '534).

11. The instant claims are directed toward medical devices having resorbable particles embedded in a resorbable matrix where the particles resorb at a different (faster) rate than the matrix.

12. '484 teaches biomedical implants having resorbable particles (e.g. calcium alginate particles) embedded within a resorbable matrix where the particles degrade faster than the matrix in which they are implanted to form pores within the matrix (abstract; C 2, L 50-C 4, L 5-67; C 6, L 26-C 7, L 34). While teaching crosslinking of the matrix, '484 does not teach the manner in which the matrix is cross-linked (i.e. covalent or ionic) nor the specific polymers of the instant claims.

13. '534 is relied upon for teaching equivalence between the instant polymers and those of '484 as well as ionic and covalent cross-linking of these polymers in biomedical stent implants (abstract; C 2, L 4-13 and 50-68; C 3, L 35-54). Cross-linking of the polymers adds strength and stiffness to the implant.

14. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to produce biodegradable, biomedical stent implants having cross-linked biodegradable polymer with biodegradable particles dispersed therein with the motivation of ensuring strength of the implant while at the same time providing

Art Unit: 1615

controlled degradation of the implant material such that the implant need not be surgically removed.

### ***Double Patenting***

15. Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claim 33 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 34 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### ***Conclusion***

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd D Ware whose telephone number is (703) 305-1700. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (703)308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

tw  
May 12, 2003

THURMAN K. PAGE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600